

SECRET

12 OCT 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR: Information Requirements Advisory
Group Members

SUBJECT : IRAG Meeting and Agenda

1. At the last meeting of the Information Requirements Advisory Group we discussed suggested validation procedures, and several points were surfaced which require further exploration. Among these points were questions as to the types of requirements to be subject to standard procedures and the level of validation required in differing circumstances.

2. In order to narrow our approach to the validation problem to manageable proportions, I propose to apply the attached procedures and validation criteria to human resource requirements and evaluations on a short trial basis. These procedures are not for final IRAG approval at this time but are established for a 90-day experiment. At the end of that time each of us will have the opportunity to propose changes, based on practical experience from the trial, with view to formulating a final set of standard validation procedures for at least the human resource area of the requirements process.

3. Each member is requested to attend a meeting of the IRAG on Wednesday, 18 October, at 1600 hours in the DDI Conference Room (7E44) for the purpose of completing arrangements for the trial exercise.

EDWARD W. PROCTOR

Assistant Deputy Director for Intelligence

25X1A

Attachments: a/s

TAB A: Procedures for Validation of DD/S&T
and DDI Human Source Requirements

TAB B: Criteria for Validation

SECRET

SECRET

TAB A

PROCEDURES FOR VALIDATION OF DD/S&T AND DDIHUMAN SOURCE REQUIREMENTS

These procedures apply to the processing of human source requirements from the point at which the requirement is prepared by the analyst to the point at which it is served on the collector. The term "requirements" includes every request for collection action, whether it appears as Form 986 or otherwise, whether it is spontaneous or responsive to a collector's request, and whether it is an ad-hoc requirement, a guide, an evaluation, a contribution to a CIRL, IPC List, CERP, etc. The necessity for direct analyst-to-collector oral requests is recognized when time is short; however, these requests should be confirmed as soon as possible by a written request, to which these procedures will apply.

1. Analyst prepares initial draft of the requirement.
2. Analyst checks with IRS/HR/OPS to determine whether there is a duplicating requirement outstanding or under preparation in another component, to discuss possible coordination or necessity for preliminary contact with collector, and to insure that the requirement includes all information needed by the collector and by IRS.
3. Where appropriate, analyst discusses directly with collector factors bearing on feasibility of collection; IRS will assist in arranging contacts as required.
4. Analyst prepares the requirement in memorandum form addressed to Chief, HR/Operations Branch (Room 1G38), through the analyst's Branch Chief and Division Chief. The analyst may prepare a requirement on Form 986, and in the case of evaluations on the standard Evaluation Form, and forward with a covering memorandum addressed as above.
5. Division Chief reviews the requirement or evaluation in detail against the various criteria for judging its validity. If he approves, he validates by signing off on the "through" line of the memorandum.
6. Division forwards the memorandum (and attachments) to Ch/HR/OPS, Room 1G38.

SECRET

SECRET

7. IRS performs further inter-office or inter-directorate coordination of requirement or evaluation as necessary, prepares in final form, makes necessary entries in Registry, and forwards to appropriate collector or collectors.

8. All human source collectors will process their requests for substantive requirements and evaluations through IRS, which will assist in ensuring that all appropriate production components have an opportunity to participate in the requested action.

SECRET

SECRET

TAB B

CRITERIA FOR VALIDATION

1. Is the topic a responsibility of the office and of importance to its production program?
2. Do the statements clearly and precisely define an information gap? The requirement should not be a broad description of an analytical problem more susceptible to research than to collection.
3. If the information is acquired, how will it be used? How will it add to or change a major intelligence position or publication in a significant manner? What is the risk to the production of finished intelligence in not asking for the information?
4. Is the requirement likely to cause new and significant information to be reported? Does the requirement or the evaluation encourage the reporting of detail or minutia beyond that really needed for intelligence purposes (i.e., "nice-to-have" information).
5. What has been done to be sure that the requested information is not already available in an intelligence community repository or exploitation facility, the files of another U.S. government agency, or in library or open source materials?
6. Are there existing requirements written by your office which already serve the intended purpose of the new one?
7. Should the statement of need or the evaluation be coordinated with other production components having interest in the topic?
8. Are the statements so general on an obviously critical need (e.g., Soviet ABM info is urgently needed) as to serve no useful purpose to a collector?
9. Does the requirement fit the responsibilities and capabilities of the intended collector? Is the collector likely to be able to satisfy it in the foreseeable future? Will the information benefits justify the cost?
10. In the case of a solicited requirement or an evaluation of spontaneous reporting, would you have asked for this information if the opportunity to receive it had not been offered? Is the responsive requirement or the evaluation encouraging the most appropriate collector to report or to continue reporting beyond what is needed?

SECRET